

STATE OF MICHIGAN  
COURT OF APPEALS

---

In the Matter of HAYDEN NATHANIEL  
JEWELL, Minor.

---

DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES,

Petitioner-Appellee,

v

JODI LYNN JEWELL,

Respondent-Appellant.

---

UNPUBLISHED  
October 13, 2009

No. 291463  
Monroe Circuit Court  
Family Division  
LC No. 08-020521-NA

Before: K. F. Kelly, P.J., and Jansen and Fitzgerald, JJ.

MEMORANDUM.

Respondent appeals as of right from the trial court's order terminating her parental rights to the minor child pursuant to MCL 712A.19b(3)(c)(i), (g), and (j). We affirm.

On appeal, respondent argues that the trial court erred in finding that the statutory grounds for termination were established by clear and convincing evidence and that termination was in the child's best interests. We disagree. We review for clear error a trial court's decision that at least one of the grounds for termination was established, as well as the court's decision regarding the child's best interests. *In re JK*, 468 Mich 202, 209-210; 661 NW2d 216 (2003).

Here, respondent's history of mental illness and instability resulting from that mental illness prevented her from providing proper care and custody for her child. Although respondent's condition improved when she took her medication, she had a history of discontinuing her treatment and medication when her symptoms improved. Testimony further indicated that her prognosis for recovery in the near future was poor. In addition, respondent continued to lack stable housing and employment at the time of the termination hearing. Given the foregoing, and the fact that respondent would require at least a year and a half to firmly establish ongoing benefits from treatment assuming that she could commit to complying with her treatment, the trial court did not clearly in finding that the statutory grounds for termination had been established by clear and convincing evidence.

Respondent's further argument that termination was not in the child's best interests is also of no avail. Considering the developmental delays that the child experienced while in respondent's custody and that there was no bond between respondent and the child after a year-

long separation, we also conclude that the trial court did not clearly err in finding that termination of respondent's parental rights was in the child's best interests. MCL 712A.19b(5).

Affirmed.

/s/ Kirsten Frank Kelly  
/s/ Kathleen Jansen  
/s/ E. Thomas Fitzgerald